E·N·V·I·R·O·N·I·C·S

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
45 Charles Street East
Toronto, Canada M4Y 1S2
Tel: (416) 964-1397 / Fax: (416) 964-2486

A Qualitative Investigation of Public Opinion on Sentencing, Corrections and Parole

Document Released Under the Access to Information Act/Document divulgué en vertu de la Loi sur l'accès à l'information.

Final Report

Prepared for: Solicitor General Canada

Prepared by: Environics Research Group Limited and
Dorothy Aaron Research Limited

June, 1989

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

FOREWORD 1

I. Perceptions of Personal Safety 4

II. Perceptions of the Criminal Justice System 5

III. Attitudes to Sentencing 12

IV. Perceptions of Parole 15

V. Perceptions of Rehabilitation 19

VI. Priorities for Reform 21

VII. Communications Issues 22

VIII. Conclusions 24

APPENDICES:

I. DISCUSSION GUIDE
II. RECRUITMENT SCREENER

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In March, 1989, Solicitor General Canada commissioned Environics Research Group Limited, in association with Dorothy Aaron Research Limited, to conduct focus group research regarding Canadian opinion on aspects of the criminal justice system, particularly sentencing and corrections issues.

Ten focus group discussions were conducted among the general population in March, 1989 in five cities across Canada.

The following are the major findings and conclusions of the study:

- General fears for personal safety are not strong, and tend to focus on particular concerns, such as youth gangs. With the exception of Toronto, where fear of parolees was mentioned, parolees are not a major source of public concern.

- Attitudes toward the criminal justice system as a whole are much more negative than positive, due to perceptions of failure at an operational level (offenders are not charged in the first place, or get very light penalties) and of unfair or inconsistent justice (the rich and powerful get off easier than others).

- Other common negative perceptions of the system include:

    - there is too much concern with offenders' rights;

    - prisons are not unpleasant enough to serve as a deterrent;

    - courts are inefficient.

- Sentencing is viewed as far too lenient. Although many would like to see judges subject to more stringent guidelines in sentencing, the prevailing sentiment is that it is proper to leave much discretion to judges.

- The idea of alternatives to prison for non-violent offenders is attractive, especially community service (if properly supervised) and restitution. Other ideas include: work camps; military service; and electronic monitoring.

- Attitudes to parole are largely negative, mainly due to perceptions such as: the offender "gets off" too soon; parole is virtually automatic after one-third of the sentence; the nature of the offender's crime and risk to society is not considered well enough.

- However, parole is seen to have some merit in principle. Support for parole would likely increase if people better understood its role in rehabilitation; if the minimum time before eligibility were longer; if it depended on an offender's efforts at rehabilitation rather than just "good behaviour"; if there were better supervision and support of parolees; and especially if potential parolees were screened more carefully.

- The importance of rehabilitation is recognized in principle, but there is less awareness of its components, such as recreation and work programs in prison.

- The idea of half-way houses is appealing, and there is recognition of the need for more of them, but few people are comfortable with having them in their own neighbourhoods.

- The government is perceived to have no interest in reforming the criminal justice system, except in reaction to pressure.

- Credible spokespeople for reform might be police or police chiefs, criminologists, psychologists, judges, or even ex-convicts, but not politicians.

- Public opinion regarding priorities for reform focuses on the reinstatement of capital punishment and making prison life tougher. Other ideas for reform include: more crime prevention efforts; harsher sentences for violent and repeat offenders; making prisons productive; and better rehabilitation.

FOREWORD

Introduction

In March, 1989, Solicitor General Canada commissioned Environics Research Group Limited, in association with Dorothy Aaron Research Limited, to conduct focus group research regarding Canadian opinion on aspects of the criminal justice system, particularly sentencing and corrections issues.

The research was commissioned to provide input into the development of a discussion paper, which is being prepared by Solicitor General Canada in co-operation with the Department of Justice, on the topic of sentencing and corrections reform.

The information will also be used in developing the communications plan for releasing the joint discussion paper, and announcing other upcoming corrections reforms.

The results of this study will provide a comparison to a similar study conducted in Toronto last year prior to the announcement of a federal parole initiative, to determine whether public opinion in that city has changed in the interim. In addition, this qualitative study will provide a complement to quantitative information in a recent Environics' FOCUS CANADA survey of Canadian public opinion on crime and justice issues.

Method

Ten focus group discussions were conducted in five cities in mid- to late March, 1989: Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal (in French), and Halifax. The two groups in each city (with seven to ten respondents each) were differentiated on the basis of socio-economic factors, i.e., one group represented blue collar occupations, the other white collar. Respondents, men and women from 25 to 50, were screened to ensure they had no experience or special interest in the criminal justice system or related occupations. A wide range of occupations was represented.

A copy of the Recruitment Screen is appended to this report.

Discussion Topics

Each session began with a brief discussion on perceptions of safety in the respondents' city, to see whether fears for personal safety (if any) centre on a particular segment of the population (e.g., parolees). The discussions then focused on the following topics:

- perceptions of the criminal justice system in general;
- perceptions of the fairness of sentencing, and in particular, whether judges should have written guidelines in sentencing;
- attitudes to alternatives to prison for non-violent offenders;
- comprehension of, and attitudes toward, parole; including ideas for changes to the parole system;
- perceptions of rehabilitation, especially half-way houses, including ideas for changes;
- perceptions as to how interested the government seems to be in criminal justice reform;
- the potential credibility of various types of spokespeople for criminal justice reform;
- respondents' priorities for changes to the criminal justice system.

A copy of the Discussion Guide is appended to this report.

The Report

This report is based on the perceptions and attitudes of 84 people who — due to the relatively small number and special (non-random) recruiting procedures — may or may not represent the views of the Canadian public in these five urban centres. As in all qualitative studies, the results must be regarded as only suggestive of public opinion on these issues, rather than as conclusive.

The Report discusses the focus group findings under eight headings:

- perceptions of personal safety
- perceptions of the criminal justice system
- attitudes to sentencing
- perceptions of parole
- perceptions of rehabilitation
- priorities for reform
- communications issues
- conclusions

I. Perceptions of Personal Safety

All discussion groups expressed a strong sense that Canada is not as safe today as in the past, and many people say they have adjusted their lifestyles accordingly. However, there is no general sense of fear with regard to personal safety, but rather there are specific fears.

The most frequently mentioned source of fear in all five cities in this study was youth and youth gangs. Participants feared youth "swarming at shopping malls," congregating "on certain streets", and, in Montreal, on buses or public transport. The latter anxiety was likely top of mind among the Montreal groups because of publicity surrounding recent stabbings on the transportation system in that city.

In a few groups, fears were expressed about the potential harm people on drugs might cause. The drug problem in St. James Town in Toronto was specifically mentioned. Fear of people who had been drinking was mentioned as a concern in Halifax, while a few people in Vancouver and Winnipeg feared pedophiles, because of specific incidents in those cities.

Only some participants in the Toronto groups mentioned fear of parolees or people in half-way houses. There was awareness and mention of a recent murder in a half-way house in Toronto. Groups in other cities also exhibited some awareness of potential problems with half-way house residents, but only when this topic was discussed specifically.

Interestingly, the fears of groups in Halifax and Vancouver tended to centre on specific areas of the city, rather than on segments of the population.

Overall, a growing sense of insecurity is beginning to manifest changes in the lifestyles of Canadians. Some Winnipeg group members, for example, mentioned that they are now locking their doors whereas they did not in the past. Some women in all five cities said they restrict their outside activities at night because they are afraid to be on the streets alone.

It is also clear that the amount of media attention and publicity currently focused on particular issues has influenced the responses of the discussion groups. Thus, Toronto group participants, where recent violent occurrences involving youth have received much media attention, expressed the strongest fear of youth gangs.

It should also be noted that while there were some differences of opinion and perception between white and blue collar groups, these are not strong. Clear differences between the two socio-economic groups did not emerge.

II. Perceptions of the Criminal Justice System

Group members were asked to share their knowledge about the purpose of the criminal justice system and its components. They were also asked to elaborate on their feelings about whether it served its purpose and their positive and negative impressions about benefits and problems.

To summarize, groups members demonstrated a very basic knowledge about the system, its mandate, and functions. While their top-of-mind perceptions were largely negative, the overall attitude was that the system is imperfect but workable. There was a clear-cut distinction between fairly positive perceptions about the system in theory and quite negative attitudes toward how it works in reality. Indeed, participants often expressed resentment and dismay, and sometimes even anger, about how it operated.

A. Components

The discussion groups exhibited high awareness about four main components of the criminal justice system: police/law enforcement officers, judges, lawyers and prisons. There was less awareness of lawmakers as an important component of the system, and limited mention of the media.

Almost all groups immediately mentioned police as the most obvious and important component of the criminal justice system. Judges, juries and courts were the next most obvious component of the justice system.

Many groups identified lawyers as an important component of the system, but the connotation was often negative. Lawyers are perceived to be the group which benefits most from the system. In Montreal, there was some mention that judges and police chiefs also fit into this category, because of perceptions of graft.

A mix of groups, excluding Montreal, identified jails and prisons as an important component of the criminal justice system. There was some recognition among Toronto groups of parole boards, half-way houses and the rehabilitation process as components of the system.

A few groups mentioned laws and lawmakers as part of the system, and one mention of the Charter of Rights.

Some white collar groups in Halifax, Vancouver and Winnipeg identified the media as a watch-dog of the criminal justice system, and thus, in a sense a "component". The rationale was that the louder the media outcry, the quicker the system would be to respond to outstanding issues and to (perhaps) implement reforms.

B. Purpose

Generally, all groups had fairly definite ideas about what they see as the basic functions of the criminal justice system. These are outlined below in order of most frequent mention.

Almost all groups suggested that the main purpose of the criminal justice system is to protect and serve society. Implicit in this perception is the assumption that the system is in place to protect the innocent.

The next most frequently mentioned purpose was that the system should act as a deterrent to criminals. Many groups also recognized that the system functions to punish offenders. To a lesser extent, but eventually recognized by all groups when probed, was the function of rehabilitation of offenders.

Some groups expressed the opinion that the system ensured the rights of individuals and prevented chaos by keeping peace and setting societal standards. This corresponds to the notion, expressed by only a few groups, that the system reflected society's values and was an attempt to create a fair society.

C. Attitudes to the Criminal Justice System

Generally group members agreed that, despite fears for personal safety, Canadian society is not experiencing great chaos. The inference is that ultimately, the criminal justice system must be working.

At the same time, attitudes can be described as largely negative. Almost all groups initially expressed considerable negativity and resentment about the system. The seeds of positive perception exist; but it will take some effort to nurture these seeds for them to become top-of-mind in the general population.

This section explores in greater detail the positive and negative perceptions noted in group discussions, in order of prevalence.

i) Negative Attitudes

Top-of-mind for virtually all groups was the sentiment that the system is often ineffective or impotent. It was perceived by many to be laughable, "a joke", not to be taken seriously.

For example, many people have an impression of police forces as often being unable or unwilling to lay charges. Penalties, sentences and fines are criticized for being too light. There is a common feeling that offenders are "back on the street" too soon, and that indeed too many offenders "get off" altogether.

There is a sense that the system simply does not act as a deterrent as it should, since there are so many repeat offenders.

There is also a strong sense that the system lacks certain principles such as fairness or equality. There is a belief that "the rich and powerful get off" and that the system is unfair to the working class and poor people. This notion was a common opinion held by both white and blue collar groups.

As an example, it was argued that, once charged, an accused person needs money to prove innocence. This perception leads to the common assumption that wealth distorts the principle of "innocent until proven guilty". Indeed, most groups say that successful acquittal depends on whether the accused can afford a good lawyer. There was some discussion about how murderers get represented "by the finest lawyers and we can't afford them," or how difficult it is to afford legal services if one is not eligible for legal aid. There is even the sense that someone with enough money can "be out on appeal" forever.

Connected to this notion was a belief that "money will fix anything", a belief prevalent in both Montreal groups, but especially the blue collar one, where perceptions of wholesale graft and corruption exist. (This was not the case in other cities.)

Most groups believe that fair treatment depends on the individual's status in the community. There was reference to a double standard, resulting in the belief that the "working class gets the full brunt. It's more lenient for the upper class." Again, there was an expression of the feeling that some people, in particular the rich and powerful, "get off", even if guilty.

All groups felt that sentencing was inconsistent and identified this as a serious drawback and imperfection in the system. (This perception is further elaborated below in section III.) It was argued that the justice system was more efficient in charging and punishing those guilty of petty wrongdoings than it was those who committed more serious crimes. A specific example used to illustrate this was that of a person being charged for drug possession, but the "Mr. Big" in the drug world was not touched.

A few groups commented that some people get jailed despite their innocence, but there was a general sense that this is rather an unusual occurrence. Instead, the common perception is that the opposite is much more likely to be the case, i.e., that guilty parties get off.

The white collar group in Vancouver expressed concern that minorities were not treated well by the justice system and stated that some cases were never investigated because of racial discrimination. It should be noted that, when asked specifically if racial discrimination occurred in the system, many people agreed. However, racial discrimination was not a top-of-mind issue.

ii) Positive Attitudes

Despite these negative perceptions, the criminal justice system is still perceived to be a good one in some respects. At the very least, it is seen as "better than nothing". The rationale behind this seems to be that if people generally feel safe, the justice system must be working as a deterrent against more rampant crime and chaos.

There is some sense (although it is difficult to say how widespread) that the Canadian system is "one of the most civilized in the world". Some took comfort in our court system complete with judges, juries and trials — and no secret police. Others noted that different levels of police co-operate with each other. Those who compared the Canadian to the American system certainly feel ours is better in a number of ways: there are no handguns allowed in this country; more uniformity exists (as compared to local sheriffs in the United States); Canadian judges are not elected; we have "smarter" or more "humane cops."

Some pride was expressed by some respondents with regard to these points of difference. There was even some limited mention of the lack of capital punishment and the chance for parole as positive aspects of our system.

Generally, the justice system is perceived to be fair to the innocent, upholding the principle that one is innocent until proven guilty. (Although, as noted above, this principle is believed to be distorted by the ability of the affluent to affect outcomes.) Indeed, the general feeling is that the system may lean too far in this direction of innocent until proven guilty. Only rarely are "terrible mistakes" made, said some. There is some feeling that, despite occasional injustices, the system is fair to minorities, particularly in the courts.

There is some awareness that the justice system can be responsive to and reflect changes in public attitudes. For example, people generally appreciate the harsher penalties for drunk driving now in effect.

Several groups expressed basic confidence in Canadian police forces. The Toronto white collar group noted that citizens take comfort in knowing they can call the police when in trouble. Toronto police were also complimented on their excellence. Groups in other cities considered our police "fairly decent", particularly when compared against American police.

Thus, positive perceptions exist to some degree among the general population, but are not top-of-mind when people are asked to think about the Canadian criminal justice system as a whole.

D. Perceived Sources of Problems in the Criminal Justice System

Respondents overwhelmingly attributed the problems with the criminal justice system to too much concern with rights. This, it was argued, resulted in too many possible "outs" for offenders. Some groups expressed the opinion that criminals have more rights than the innocent. Montreal groups and some individuals in other cities felt strongly that there are simply too many "bleeding heart liberals."

It should be noted that no distinction was made among the discussion participants between offenders and accused; the assumption seemed to be that they were virtually the same thing, i.e., that anyone accused of a crime was almost automatically an "offender".

"We're so concerned with protecting the rights of wrong-doers that the rights of the innocent majority aren't protected," was a common sentiment. One respondent summed up the general feeling in these words: "We got so many rights, we got no rights!"

Still another comment was, "Kids aren't taught how to fill out tax forms at school, but my son was taught his 'rights,' about whether police can check his bag at a game." More than one person questioned why a man of Hong Kong origin who "mass murdered in L.A. three years ago is still here in Calgary at our cost?"

The more thoughtful among our respondents expressed the idea that "the safeguards (i.e., rights) in place are well-intended but badly abused." Other comments along these lines: "It's nice to know we have rights, but it hinders justice." ... "The pendulum has swung too far."

Other complaints pertaining to the preoccupation with rights included the idea that "too much hard evidence is required", or that "too much evidence is ruled as inadmissable". A case which was mentioned to illustrate the latter point was that of a man who murdered his wife and was charged with second degree murder rather than first. Although he had been beating her, this could not be mentioned during the trial.

There was also some feeling that too many offenders get off on technicalities. Still others felt that there are "too many chances for appeal" and "too much red tape".

Many groups expressed the opinion that prisons are not unpleasant enough to be a deterrent. In this connection, there was a strong feeling that "criminals are coddled". Some felt that "criminals get too much effort and money spent on them and they're back on the street in no time". Reference to psychologists in prison was given as an example of coddling.

It appears that most groups have the perception that prisons are relatively pleasant, perhaps even better living conditions than those outside prison for many offenders. It was said that: prisoners don't have to work hard (or indeed at all); they have three good meals a day which might even include steak ("but I can't afford steak myself," said some respondents); colour televisions in their cells; good health care and nutrition; prisoners can go to school and even earn university degrees ("I can't afford it!"); "some prisons are like a country club" or hotel; prisoners have recreation like basketball; prisoners can even get tickets to hockey games; and "most criminals don't mind prison".

The inefficiency of the court system was seen by all groups as a major problem. It was perceived to be "archaic", "inefficient", and plagued by long delays. These delays in turn created a number of problems, it was thought. For instance, it was felt that "criminals are free to continue crimes" when out on bail; that crimes are "lumped together" and when cases finally come up for trial, some never get tried due to plea bargaining. The delays also mean that facts are not fresh in witnesses' minds and that additional costs are incurred by the taxpayer. It was suggested that lawyers should not be allowed to get away with saying that, for example, eight months is not adequate preparation time, as some people think they do now.

Many groups were of the opinion that the inefficiency of the courts is partially caused by the fact that courts sit only a few hours each day. There is some cynicism revolving around this perception. One group member commented, dryly, that short days in court were common because judges have golf games at 3:30. Others felt there simply are not enough courts and judges to deal effectively with the number of offenders.

Most groups felt that sentences are too lenient to be effective as deterrents. They are felt to be inconsistent and "not what they seem to be" due to "almost automatic" parole.

Some groups also felt that "criminals get more justice than victims", i.e., that there is not enough attention given to aiding victims. Points made included: while victims live with the scars of a crime for years, "criminals get parole"; criminals get free counselling, victims must pay for it themselves; women victims often are not consulted (presumably about sentencing or parole for their offenders).

There was also some feeling that existing laws are too liberal, the Young Offenders Act being cited as a prime example. There is some concern that young people today are "street smart" and realize that the consequences for criminal behaviour are "laughable". This is because even though they may commit serious crimes, they are not tried as adults. Some groups felt that there is no deterrent for murder because there is no longer capital punishment in Canada. (As a point of interest, when reforming the system was later discussed, more than one-third of all respondents wanted capital punishment to be reinstated.)

Societal attitudes are blamed by some individuals as the indirect source of problems. With the breakdown of the family and family lifestyles, it was suggested that parents should share the blame. Public figures illustrating "no moral fibre" are also negative influences, said some respondents. The issue of sports figures and their use of steroids was given as a case in point. Both Montreal and Winnipeg respondents noted that the willingness of judges to take graft or fix tickets was no help.

In connection with society's attitudes, at least one man felt that perhaps the justice system is not as strong as it could be because the majority of Canadians have not been vocal enough in expressing their dissatisfaction with the leniency in the system.

A similar idea was voiced by some who believe that because police often lack public support, they are sometimes discouraged from pressing charges. Indeed, the police were seen as a problem area in other ways. Montrealers are convinced the police system is fraught with corruption. Other groups made the point that "police should be on the beat, not in cruisers".

III. Attitudes to Sentencing

A. Overview

The prevalent opinion among most groups is that currently, sentencing of offenders is far too lenient. Group members gave some of the following examples: a hit and run driver killed someone but only lost his license for one year; a couple were sentenced to only nine years imprisonment for the killing of their own child; a murderer was sentenced to seven years; a rapist was jailed for only three months. Some group members thought that they were aware of suspended sentences being granted for repeat offenses. Rapists in particular were mentioned as a group that "gets off too easily."

Some respondents expressed the opinion that public attitudes about sentencing may be distorted because of the issue of parole. Some felt that, as lay persons, they did not know what constituted a sentence. A few individuals noted that it is possible the media draws attention to unfair cases and that public perception about lenient sentences may be blown out of proportion.

Another strong view is that sentencing is inconsistent and not standardized. Nearly every group felt that sometimes punishment seemed to have no relation to the crime. Examples cited were: a swindler who repaid his debt was sentenced to one year while the parental murder of a child received the same sentence; an embezzler might get a ten year jail sentence while a child molester only one or two. Some people pointed out that it seemed a bank robber could get a longer sentence than a murderer. The general feeling was that it was possible to have three different sentences for people committing the same crime.

A fairly strong opinion among the discussion groups is that sentencing can sometimes be unfair and somewhat discriminatory. The feeling was that professionals and executives were likely to "get off" easier or completely. Some members of both Toronto groups commented that unfair sentencing might be the result of sexual and racial discrimination. One group felt that discrimination on the basis of appearance could even be a factor e.g.. a "scrubby" appearance. One Torontonian even cited a case of discrimination on the basis of a robber's weight.

Respondents generally recognized that sentencing was a function of the judge's responsibility. All groups agreed that sentencing seems to depend on the type of judge and his particular mood or whim. Some judges might be more liberal in philosophy than others, and if people (or their lawyers) are aware of these differences, they can even make special efforts to be assigned judges known to be lenient.

Many people conceded that judges "are human too," and subject to the same moods and foibles as the rest of us. One group even suggested that the age of a judge could be a factor on sentencing.

Other influences on sentencing mentioned by some groups were plea bargaining, and (felt to be even more important) the effect of good presentations by lawyers. Mention was made in almost all groups that people with money can afford better lawyers (who can make better presentations and are more likely to appeal). Some Toronto blue collar respondents felt that extenuating circumstances were not always considered. And again, Montrealers felt that judges and juries can be bought.

B. Guidelines for Judges

Most people believe that judges base their sentences on guidelines already in place, but the guidelines are believed to be totally flexible within minimum and maximum sentences. Many felt that precedents set by other judges serve as guidelines. There was even some feeling that judges could decide between a prison sentence or a fine or a suspended sentence, or could even ignore guidelines totally. In the end, it was not clear how much is up to the discretion of judges.

There was disagreement among respondents in the study with regard to whether guidelines for judges should be more stringent. A substantial minority felt that they should indeed be more stringent, narrowed in the direction of greater harshness, not more lenient sentencing.

However, the majority of participants disagreed with the idea of developing more stringent guidelines. These group members agreed that it was appropriate to leave the issue of sentencing to the discretion of judges, as one of their most important functions. It was felt that the status quo makes allowance for extenuating circumstances, especially for first offenders. It was pointed out (by two white collar groups) that inappropriate sentencing can always be addressed through the appeal process.

Some groups, mostly white collar, felt that guidelines for sentencing should be compulsory. Many groups, mostly blue collar, felt that there should be better supervision of judges. One group suggested that sentencing in serious cases might be done by a panel of three judges.

C. Alternatives to Prison

All groups felt strongly that there should indeed be alternatives to prison for non-violent offenders. One group felt that alternatives should also exist for some violent minor offenders (eg. street fighters). It was argued by some that sitting in prison is not an effective way to pay back a debt to society. Exceptions were made for certain types of non-violent offenders, specifically drug dealers. Some individuals in Vancouver's blue collar group suggested that extremely heavy fines might be adequate, but Montreal groups did not feel that fines were strong enough alternatives to prison sentencing.

The concept of community service was the most attractive alternative to prison sentencing. It was argued that prison can harden offenders for the worse while community service can expose offenders to decent values.

Many groups suggested that civic manual labour was a productive and effective type of community service that could be used as a form of sentencing. Specific examples included street-cleaning, maintenance of parks or manual labour such as shovelling sidewalks, cleaning bus shelters and building roads.

Community service for community organizations was only mentioned as a possibility by a few individuals. Examples included having offenders work in hospitals, libraries and in maintenance positions with schools or community centres. Non-profit groups and charities might also benefit from community service sentencing. One example given was having an offender (presumably qualified for the task) do the books for the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation.

It was generally agreed that while community service cannot be forced on offenders, it should be made available as an option. The exposure to community organizations was hoped by some to result in making offenders more community-minded. Some might even be able to see the effects of their crime on victims. This was felt to be especially good for young offenders.

There was also a perception that community service sentencing must be cheaper than prison sentencing, even if there were costs incurred to monitor it well.

All groups also expressed some concerns about community service, however. Not surprisingly, the most frequently voiced concerns revolved around issues of proper supervision of offenders, so that they actually showed up for and performed the service as required. Perhaps forgetting that this was supposed to be an alternative for non-violent offenders only, there was even some unease about offenders being free and near loved ones.

Restitution was also appealing to most groups as an alternative to prison sentencing. People liked the idea of offenders repaying their victims. It was argued that if a person charged with break and enter goes to jail, "I pay twice", once as the victim of the break and enter, and once as a taxpayer supporting an offender in jail.

Examples given of appropriate restitution included the suggestion that someone who stole from a store should be required to work in it, or the person who damaged or vandalized a home or property should be required to make repairs. However, others pointed out the some victims may not want to get involved with offenders.

Use of electronic anklets as a monitoring device had some appeal as a cheaper alternative to prison, especially suitable for first-time offenders.

Some groups thought the Armed Forces could be used as an alternative to prison, particularly for young offenders. Indeed, some people made the point that really anyone could benefit from the discipline, training, and education provided by the Armed Forces.

IV. Perceptions of Parole

A. Overview

Although attitudes toward parole are often rather negative, people generally concede that the parole system "must work some of the time." There was some awareness in most groups that the public tends to hear about the failures, not the successes. In short, people seem to agree with the objectives of parole, at least from a theoretical standpoint, and seem to feel there is a place for parole. Their problem - as with the criminal justice system itself - is with the application of the parole system, not the principle of it.

Generally, parole is recognized as part of a sentence but not as part of the punishment, and this may be another reason for negative attitudes toward parole. There are still many people who want to see offenders duly punished.

There is considerable confusion between parole, probation and mandatory supervision, which tends to cloud the issue.

Many people are aware that there are restrictions on parolees. Some assume that parolees must get a job to show they can be responsible and that they must report in regularly. However, few seem clear on the exact conditions of parole.

All groups recognized that the purpose of parole is to help a person fit back into society; it was seen by some as "controlled re-entry into society". Others identified the purpose of parole to be a chance for deserving offenders to prove themselves worthy of going back to society. Some groups felt that parole was a means to keep an eye on offenders to ensure that they did not repeat crimes.

On a more cynical note, virtually all groups felt one purpose of parole was to relieve overcrowding in prisons. Some felt the sole purpose is to encourage good behaviour in prison or at least attempts at rehabilitation. Some individuals pointed out that parole costs less than prison, which, they decided, is undoubtedly why the government is so keen on parole.

B. Perceived Benefits and Drawbacks of Parole

While there was considerable cynicism about how effective parole was in meeting its purpose or objectives, all groups appreciated the intent, i.e., the opportunity or "second chance" for offenders to fit back into society. The Montreal groups in particular applauded the parole system for being "a humane aspect" of the justice system.

There is some, although less, recognition that people cannot be helped to reintegrate into society during confinement. There is also some appreciation for parole helping prisoners focus on the future. These perceptions, however, are less widespread.

Other perceived benefits of parole are that (aside from the cynics) it does indeed relieve overcrowding in prisons and encourage good behaviour in prison. In short, there was appreciation in all groups that there are some benefits of parole.

However, most groups expressed generally negative attitudes about the parole system in practice. Opinions were often expressed very emotionally with group members displaying a sense of outrage or simply helplessness: "What can we do?"

The prime reason for these negative attitudes seems to be a feeling that parole ends the punishment too soon. There is a nagging sense that "feels like they're (the offenders) getting away with crime."

Many groups feel that because of parole a sentence is not what it seems to be. "We should call a spade a spade." A life sentence should equal a life sentence, said another group. Some groups feel that parole "spoils" the use of prison as a deterrent to crime.

Another important factor in negative attitudes to parole is the widespread perception that there is not enough discrimination as to who gets parole. Nearly everyone assumes that parole is virtually automatically available to all, including violent offenders. There is only limited awareness that it is not automatically granted (or else there is confusion between parole and mandatory supervision, which applies to the final one-third of sentences).

When there was awareness that decisions about parole are up to a parole board, these boards were criticized for making "poor judgement calls", probably "with not enough information". One group felt that guidelines were inconsistent from board to board. There was some recognition, however, that it must be difficult to determine who should or who should not get parole.

Respondents agreed almost unanimously that some offenders should not be eligible for parole under any circumstances. Prime exclusions, according to most people, would be (first degree) murderers and multiple offenders.

The risk to society of parolees, another drawback to the system, was top-of-mind in only two groups (Toronto white collar and Winnipeg blue collar). However, there was a general feeling across all groups that this factor is probably not considered enough in determinations as to who gets parole.

More to the point, perhaps, was the perception in several groups that there is not close enough supervision of parolees. One person expressed the belief that a parolee would have to miss six appointments before consequences resulted. Others in the same group (Toronto white collar) were not so sure, but tended to assume that parole officers were overworked.

There was some feeling, particularly in blue collar groups, that parole is not an active enough form of rehabilitation. "Offenders are dumped into society and expected to make it on their own." Some white collar individuals rationalized that probably parole officers don't have enough time to really help.

Still others were neutral about parole. Some expressed the feeling that there was no way of really knowing how effective it is because "we don't hear of successes."

C. Criteria for Parole

All groups believed that the main criterion for parole is good behaviour. However, the prevailing feeling was that while good behaviour merited consideration, it should be a minor factor in deciding parole because it is "too easy to fake"; "it's necessary to look behind the facade".

Length of time served is generally recognized as a criterion for parole, with offenders being eligible for parole after a certain minimum period of time was served.

The majority of respondents were under the impression that offenders had to serve one-third of their sentence before being eligible for parole. A number thought 25 percent (or something less than one-third of a sentence) had to be complete; and the rest ranged from 40% to two-thirds in their beliefs. Some people admitted to having no idea, while others thought it would depend on the length of the sentence or crime committed.

When asked what the time factor should be, the majority viewpoint was that offenders should not be eligible for parole until 50 percent or more of their sentence was complete. A few people felt offenders should serve 60 percent of their sentence; others felt two-thirds or 75 percent should be served. Only a few respondents felt offenders should be considered for parole after having served less than 50 percent of their sentence, and then only if non-violent offenders.

A few people (in the Toronto white collar and Winnipeg blue collar groups) felt offenders should serve all their time. As noted earlier, the general sentiment was certainly that parole should not be allowed for murderers or repeat offenders, or indeed certain other types of violent offenders.

It was generally thought that risk to society and public safety were not assessed well enough when parole was being considered. The recent murder of a girl in Toronto by a parolee was used to illustrate this point, but even when people were not aware of this incident, the feeling was that risk needs to be considered more.

There was also a strong feeling that parole should not be available to repeat offenders, or at least not as easily as it seems now. (Some people did not think repeat offenses was a consideration at all now.)

Most groups felt comfortable with the assessment of attitude and stability in offenders conducted by experts as a consideration for parole. However, there was some concern that "it's too easy to fake it." It was suggested that if assessments were based on the evaluation of several different psychiatrists or other professionals, they would be more reliable. It was also often suggested that such assessments should be based largely on the offender's attempts at self-improvement in prison, perhaps through education and training.

Some groups felt that the skills and job potential of offenders should be taken into consideration before granting parole, as well as the availability of a support system (e.g., family environment) for the returning offender.

There was also some mention of family need (e.g., dependents) as a consideration for parole.

V. Perceptions of Rehabilitation

A. Overview

There was virtually unanimous agreement among respondents in this study that rehabilitation should be one goal of imprisonment. Two blue collar groups (Toronto and Halifax) perceived it as the prime goal; but all the others saw it as less important than the goals of protection of society, punishment, and deterrence.

However, there was also general recognition that rehabilitation is difficult to achieve, on the basis that so many offenders are repeaters. Indeed, there was a common feeling that many offenders are beyond rehabilitation. It was suggested that if an offender had been in prison for a long time, crime was the only thing they would know. The Montreal groups pointed out that prison is often a "school for crime", making specific reference to the availability of drugs in prison.

When questioned about methods of rehabilitation used in prisons, the respondents identified quite a number of possibilities, although not all of these were regarded as bona fide "rehabilitation". Most often mentioned were occupational training and education. Aside from basic literacy and high school courses, there was some awareness that prisoners are able to earn university degrees while in jail, and that it is even possible for them to "become a lawyer" while in prison, which bothered many respondents.

The availability of counselling to prisoners was often recognized as an important form of rehabilitation, along with some feeling (in two white collar groups) that there should be more counselling, especially pre-parole.

Interestingly, only a few people identified work in prison as a form of rehabilitation, although there was some feeling that giving prisoners some responsibility (like taking care of the library) would be a type of rehabilitation.

Similarly, although there was general awareness of the availability of recreation and sports programs in prisons, only the Halifax blue collar group saw this as one aspect of rehabilitation, "so that they could feel better about themselves."

There are signs that some people are totally unaware of any type of rehabilitation in prison, or at least nothing that is considered "a proper rehabilitation program".

A prevalent view was that there is a need for different levels of security in the penal system, through which prisoners must progress before they are released, indicating there is little awareness that this exists now.

There was a more limited recognition of rehabilitation programs after prison, primarily half-way houses and "hopefully, counselling". The John Howard Society was mentioned in only one group, along with the idea that it was probably more effective than government programs.

Some people believed that community service was one form of post-prison rehabilitation, although there were also some jokes made about the effectiveness of this option. "They just get joe jobs, nothing worthwhile," said one person. But others felt that community service was worthwhile if supervision was effective. It was pointed out that community service could make offenders feel better about themselves and "expose them to decent values".

Employer programs were also mentioned by a few respondents as part of rehabilitation. Restitution was thought to be a rehabilitation tool by some as well.

B. Attitudes to Half-Way Houses

In general, people agree with the idea of half-way houses but are not supportive of having them in their own neighbourhoods.

The concept of half-way houses as a means of helping people ease back into society is a positive one. There is some recognition that offenders may have no place to go, or that at least these houses serve to keep ex-convicts away from the environment in which they created their crimes. Other perceived benefits are that half-way houses help offenders develop a routine and take on responsibility gradually. There was some feeling that half-way houses "probably help many people".

Some individuals in the groups were aware of half-way houses near them or relatives, and spoke of there being "no problems at all". Others suggested that half-way homes probably already existed in their areas only they were not aware of them. Still others rationalized that residents of group homes probably would not commit crimes in the neighbourhood they were living in.

There were some strong negative feelings about half-way houses expressed as well. Some members of two groups (Toronto white collar and Halifax blue collar) were aware of murders committed by half-way home residents while on parole. As a result, there was some feeling that there is not enough communication between the staff at houses and "the system", along with a perception that half-way house staff are not knowledgeable enough.

But even when there was no awareness of specific crimes committed by half-way house residents, there was a great deal of concern about the security and supervision in half-way houses.

There was a general feeling that half-way houses do not screen residents carefully enough, so that "you never know who's there." It was thought that residents could also bring undesirables into the neighbourhood. Many men in the discussion groups professed concern more for the security and safety of their wives and children than themselves. There was even some worry about the use of "bad language" in the neighbourhood. In short, many of the negative attitudes to half-way houses resulted from people's fear of the unknown.

Nevertheless, there were a few members in most of the discussion groups who said they would support a half-way house in their areas. (The exceptions were both Montreal groups, and white collar groups in Toronto and Halifax.) There were some qualifications placed on this "support", at least in some cases: that there should only be a few residents and that they be well supervised. Another qualifier was that neighbours and police had to be kept informed of plans and activities.

However, it is not surprising that the majority of respondents in this study would not support half-way homes in their own community, at least "not as they are run now".

There was some discussion in most groups about locating half-way houses in non-residential areas, which would certainly allay fears of neighbourhood security. But this option was recognized by some as defeating the aim of integrating past offenders into the community.

VI. Priorities for Reform

Respondents were asked what specific changes they would most like to see in the criminal justice system. In response, fully one-third of all discussion group members cited the re-institution of capital punishment as a priority for reform. Even among those who did not perceive it as a priority, there was considerable sentiment in favour of capital punishment. At the very least, there was a general feeling that the issue should be addressed through a national referendum.

Quite a number of respondents (mainly white collar) felt that, as a priority, prison life should be made tougher. According to many of these people, it should "scare the living daylights out of them" so that it would serve as an effective deterrent to further crime. For example, some said prisoners should be sleeping ten to a room, working hard labour, eating simple meals, and not have access to privileges or amenities. But even among those for whom toughening prison life was not a priority, the feeling was that any comforts or privileges beyond the bare minimum should be earned by an offender's good behaviour and efforts at rehabilitation.

Some white collar respondents felt strongly that prisons should be made more productive so that they pay for themselves. It was even suggested that prisoners could be charged for their keep.

There were a number of individuals in both white and blue collar groups who felt that the most important reform would be greater emphasis on crime prevention. The prevailing idea was that there should be more education in schools about the justice system and the consequences of crime. The "Scared Straight" program was mentioned by one respondent as effective in this regard. Other suggestions for crime prevention measures included: more research into what makes people get into crime; counselling of street kids; identifying potential offenders earlier and helping them.

The Montreal groups mentioned more police patrol as a means of effective crime prevention.

For some individuals (mainly white collar), harsher sentences for certain offenders were seen as a priority: violent and hard-core offenders (repeaters) in particular. The more dangerous ones should be "locked up for good" according to a few.

Still others (mainly blue collar) felt that a priority for reform would be better rehabilitation programs for offenders.

Individual suggestions for changes included: more alternatives to prison for non-violent offenders, or more leniency for this group; making violent offenders ineligible for parole; changing the Young Offenders Act; and changing laws so that people cannot get off on technicalities.

VII. Communications Issues

A. Perceptions of Government Interest in Reform

The common consensus is that "the government" has no real interest in reforming the criminal justice system (except perhaps to save money), but only reacts to pressure from lobby groups or the media. There is no sense of the government having any interest in public opinion with regard to law reform.

It was pointed out that the government has ignored the general outrage at the Young Offenders Act, and that it refused to hold a referendum on capital punishment. Examples given of the government's reactive stance included the idea (in one group) that changes made to the Young Offenders Act "last May" were due only to pressure from the media, and that drunk driving laws were changed due to public pressure.

On the other hand, some individuals acknowledged occasional small signs of interest in reform on the part of the government: surveys "like this one"; the Donald Marshall enquiry; victim compensation funds; and the current review of the Young Offenders Act.

Other groups cited as interested in reform included lawyers, police chiefs, prison guards, abortion issue groups, prisoner rights groups, MADD, Amnesty International, crime victims, John Howard Society, native groups, social workers and psychologists.

B. Credible Spokespeople

In an attempt to determine who might be credible spokespeople for reform, respondents were asked whom they would be inclined to believe most in a debate on reforms to the justice system. While they volunteered a wide range of responses, it was clear that politicians are not viewed as credible spokespeople.

Many perceived police or police chiefs as credible spokespeople, because of their "day-to-day" and "first-hand" experience with the criminal element. (Montrealers specifically disagreed, however, likely because of perceptions of corruption).

Criminologists and sociologists were also perceived by many respondents as credible spokespeople (in some cases, though, only after it was explained to them what these occupations involve) because they were thought to be have an unbiased viewpoint due to their lack of personal involvement in the system.

Some felt that judges would be credible spokespeople also because of their perceived unbiased viewpoints. Other types of spokespeople that would be credible at least to some individuals include: ex-convicts, social workers, psychologists, prison wardens, prison chaplains, and criminal lawyers.

VIII. Conclusions

A. Quantiative and Qualitative Research

The focus group research reported here reflects a number of trends and themes in Canadian public opinion found in Environics' December, 1988 FOCUS CANADA survey of approximately 2000 Canadians, including:

- the strong perception among the Canadian public that the justice system is biased in favour of wealthy Canadians.
- the strong perception that punishments (sentencing) for lawbreakers are too lenient.
- the moderately high levels of confidence in police forces, at least in comparison to the court system, lawmakers, and lawyers.
- the fairly low, although growing, level of fears for personal safety.
- the strong desire for reform, but not abolition, of the parole system.

B. Recommendations

Because so much public opinion appears to be based on incomplete, confused and inaccurate knowledge and perceptions, a communications program might be a key to changing negative attitudes about the Canadian criminal justice system.

The following are some suggestions in this regard.

Consideration should be given to communication which reinforces public perceptions about the positive aspects of the system, the importance and benefits of rehabilitation, and the ways in which this is accomplished through activities in prison, parole, and half-way houses.

There is especially a need to provide the public with accurate information about parole: the success rate of parole; the cost of keeping offenders in prison versus other alternatives; costs and benefits of parole; who gets parole and how it is determined. "I'd feel a lot better about it if I knew," said one typical respondent. It should be stressed that parole is not automatic, and that indeed most offenders do not get parole on their first application. People need clarification that parole is part of a sentence, but a part that is concerned with rehabilitation rather than punishment.

There are a number of parole reforms that might also help change negative public attitudes toward the parole system (providing the public knew about them), including:

- greater selectivity as to who gets parole;
- better support for parolees to find jobs, housing, get therapy and counselling;
- combining parole with restitution and/or community service;
- better supervision of parolees;
- more employer programs for parolees.

There is also a need to provide information about half-way houses: what they are, how they work, how many residents normally live in one, what type of offenders live in one, and what type of supervision there is.

Substantive changes, or public reassurance, in the following areas related to half-way houses might be considered:

- better security and cross-checks;
- making sure there is enough well-trained staff;
- limited number of residents;
- locating them near police stations;
- perhaps combining half-way house programs with employment programs or corporate sponsorships.

The following alternatives to prison for non-violent offenders emerged from the study as popular among the public:

- community service, with good supervision and support;
- restitution;
- establishment of work camps, if feasible;
- the Armed Forces;
- electronic monitoring.

The study suggests that there are also a number of prison reforms that the public would likely support, including:

- segregation of prisoners so that serious offenders do not influence those who are likely candidates for rehabilitation;
- creation of a special type of prison equivalent to trade school, for offenders who seriously want to rehabilitate themselves.
- compulsory work activity for prisoners, whether some sort of labour, learning a trade, or perhaps even teaching others their own trade, so that all are forced to assume some responsibility;
- occupational training (in jobs that offer more than minimum wage) for anyone with no proper skills;
- support groups (i.e., group therapy) for prisoners with drug and alcohol abuse problems;
- no privileges in prison (e.g., TV, conjugal visits, better-than-basic food; recreation) unless earned through work and good behaviour;
- more pre-parole planning and counselling.

Consideration should be give to providing more aid to victims, especially psychological help and counselling.

Finally, consideration should be given to publicizing reform initiatives or ideas, even at early stages. This may serve as an opportunity to dispel the notion that the criminal justice system is rigid; most people are not aware that reform is a continuous and ongoing process.

APPENDICES:

I. DISCUSSION GUIDE
II. RECRUITMENT SCREENER

DISCUSSION GUIDE

Introduction: Please tell us a little about yourself: what work you do; the composition of your family...

Personal Safety

1. How safe do you feel living in (your city)? Why? Do you feel more or less safe than in the 70's? Why? If less safe, have you changed your lifestyle or behaviour as a result?

2. What fears do you have for your safety? Why? Any specific types or groups of people that you fear? Why?

Criminal Justice System

3. What comes to mind when you think of the criminal justice system in Canada? What else? Why? What are the various components of the system, as far as you're concerned?

4. What's the purpose of the criminal justice system? Whom do you think it's supposed to serve? Anyone else? (If necessary: what might happen if there was no such system?)

5. How well does the criminal justice system serve its purpose? What's particularly good about it? What's wrong with it? Where do the problems lie: the laws? law enforcement? the courts? the corrections system?

Sentencing

6. What's your impression of the sentencing process in Canada? Is it generally fair? Do offenders get the sentences they deserve for their crimes? Are their any ways in which sentencing is not fair? Any examples? (Probe for feeling that judge could be influenced by race, sex, income, etc...)

7. Should judges have written guidelines to help them in sentencing? If so, should use of the guidelines be compulsory?

8. Should non-violent offenders always be sentenced to prison? What other alternatives might there be?

Parole

9. Do offenders generally serve the whole length of their sentences? If not, why not? What happens instead? How do you feel about this? Should offenders have to serve their entire sentences in prison? (Probe whether parole considered part of sentence, or something distinct.)

10. What comes to mind when you hear the term "parole"? Why? What is parole? How does it work?

11. What do you think is the purpose of parole? Whom is it supposed to serve? How well does it serve this purpose?

12. What are the possible benefits of the parole system? What might happen if there was no such thing as parole? (Probe: civilized society; protection of public; incentive for good behaviour in prison; concept of supervision & control...)

13. What are the drawbacks to the parole system? (Probe perceptions of risk) Should the public accept this risk? Under what circumstances?

14. Under what circumstances does a prisoner get parole? Under what circumstances should parole be granted? How would these circumstances be determined? Should there be automatic parole? What about the following circumstances:
—type of crime (violent vs. non-violent)?
—no risk to public safety? (how determine?)
—no risk to public property? (how determine?)
—sentencing judge requests early release?
—experts say offender is rehabilitated?
—good behaviour in prison?

15. How much of a sentence does a prisoner serve before becoming eligible for parole? How much do you think it should be? What do you think about it being one-third? Should good behaviour affect this timing?

Rehabilitation

16. What do you think should be the goal of imprisonment? How does / would rehabilitation fit in?

17. What comes to mind when you think of "rehabilitation"? Why? What constitutes rehabilitation?

18. How are prisoners rehabilitated now? Are changes needed? In what ways? (Probe approach, money, personnel)

19. What do you think of half-way houses? What's good / not so good about them? Should there be more of them? Would you support one in your community?

Spokespeople

20. Who seems to be most interested in changes to the criminal justice system? What particular groups or bodies? Any others? Why do you suppose that is?

21. What about the government? How much of a priority do you think it is right now? What gives that impression? Can you think of any actions the government has taken in this area recently? What's your impression of those actions?

22. In a debate about prisons, sentencing, and reform to the criminal justice system, who would you tend to believe most: a police chief? a criminologist? a politician? someone else?

23. If you could change one thing about the criminal justice system, sentencing, and prisons, what might that be? Why?

PROJECT # : 3-19-89

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ P.C. _____

Tel # Res _____ Bus _____

Date _____ Time _____

Recruiter's Name _____

RECRUITMENT SCREENER

1a. Have you ever attended a consumer group discussion, an interview or survey which was arranged in advance and for which you received a sum of money?

Yes ( ) - MAX 1 GROUP
NO ( ) - SKIP TO 2a

IF YES, ASK

b. How long ago was it? _____ TERMINATE IF IN THE PAST 6 MONTHS

c. How many groups have you attended? _____

What topics have you discussed? _____

_____

_____

TERMINATE IF _____ MENTIONED OR IF ATTENDED MORE THAN FIVE GROUPS.

2a. Are you .. SINGLE ( ) MARRIED/CO-HAB ( ) DIVORCED/SEP ( ) WIDOW ( ).

b. Are you the head of the household?

YES ( )
NO ( )

3a. What is your current occupation? _____ / _____
Type of Job Type of Company

b. Have you yourself ever worked in ... READ LIST

	3b		4a	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
SOCIAL OR WELFARE WORKER	( )	( )	( )	( )
PRISON OR CORRECTIONS EMPLOYEE	( )	( )	( )	( )
MARKET RESEARCH	( )	( )	( )	( )
MARKETING	( )	( )	( )	( )
ADVERTISING	( )	( )	( )	( )
ANY MEDIA (RADIO, TV, PRINT)	( )	( )	( )	( )
PUBLIC RELATIONS	( )	( )	( )	( )
BEEN AN ACTRA MEMBER	( )	( )	( )	( )
POLICE OR LAWYER	( )	( )	( )	( )
CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM	( )	( )	( )	( )
PUBLIC HOUSING				

4a. Do any members of your family currently work for ... REPEAT ABOVE LIST

TERMINATE IF YES TO ANY IN 3b OR 4a

IF MARRIED/CO-HAB, ASK:

b. What is your spouse's current occupation? _____ / _____
Type of Job Type of Company

5. How many years have you lived in _____ ?

ALL MY LIFE ( )

OTHER _____ TERMINATE IF LESS THAN 10 YEARS

6. What is your age? _____

25-50 ( )
_____ ( )
_____ ( )
_____ ( )

7. Sometimes participants are also asked to write out their answers to a questionnaire or watch a TV commercial during the discussion. Is there any reason why you could not participate?

8. What was the last year of education completed? RECORD

9. Which of the following best represents your total household income?

Under $15,000	( )
15,000 to 20,000	( )
20,000 to 25,000	( )
25,000 to 35,000	( )
35,000 to 45,000	( )
Over $45,000	( )

OBTAIN A GOOD MIX

10. What is the total number living in your household? _____

11. List ages of children if any. _____

12. Do you have any special interest or involvement in any of the following?

WELFARE SYSTEM	( )
CRIMINAL JUSTICE OR CORRECTION SYSTEMS	( )
HOUSING AUTHORITY	( )
OTHER _____ (SPECIFY)	( )

*IF SPECIAL INTEREST AND INVOLVEMENT MENTIONED ASK;

13. What is your special interest or involvement? _____

_____

IF CANADIAN CRIMINAL JUSTICE ASSOCIATION MENTIONED - TERMINATE.

14. Have you or any of your immediate friends or relations had any personal contact with any of the following?

PUBLIC HOUSING	( )
SOCIAL WELFARE SYSTEM	( )
CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM	( ) - TERMINATE IF MENTIONED